

**DOCKET NO: 240831US3** 

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF

: EXAMINER: FERGUSON, M. L.

MITSUO SATO ET AL.

SERIAL NO: 10/626,604

: GROUP ART UNIT: 2854

FILED: JULY 25, 2003

FOR: PRINTER OPERABLE IN A

**DUPLEX PRINT MODE** 

## **PROVISIONAL ELECTION**

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Office Action dated June 13, 2005, Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, Group I, Subgroup a, Claims 1-22, 34-45, 46-57, 70-93, 106-117, and 124-135 for further examination on the merits in the present application.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement because the PTO has not carried forward its burden of proof to establish that searching and examining the noted sets of claims would be an undue burden.

In particular, MPEP § 803 states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

The claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> To do justice to either identified groups of claims, it is respectfully submitted that it would be necessary to search in all classes and subclasses identified in numbered paragraphs 1 and 4 of the outstanding Official Action.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the outstanding Restriction

Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.

Gregory J. Maier

Attorney of Record

Registration No. 25,599 Raymond F. Cardillo, Jr.

Registration No. 40,440

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{Customer Number} \\ 22850 \end{array}$ 

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04) GJM/RFC/RFF/ys

I:\ATTY\RFF\24s\240831\240831-RESTRICTION.DOC